

MAR 23 1933

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, N. Y. In the United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere \$2.50. Single numbers, to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents. Address Charles Knapp, 1737 Sedgwick Ave., New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOLUME XXVI, No. 20

MONDAY, MARCH 27, 1933

WHOLE No. 710

The Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States

will be held on

Friday Afternoon and Evening, April 28

Saturday Morning and Afternoon, April 29

at

Barnard College, Columbia University

There will be a

SUBSCRIPTION DINNER AT 7 P. M. APRIL 28

and a

SUBSCRIPTION LUNCHEON AT 12:30, APRIL 29

The Classical Association of the Atlantic States

OFFICERS 1932-1933

President: Professor Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Secretary-Treasurer: Professor Charles Knapp, Barnard College, Columbia University

Vice-Presidents:

Miss Elsie I. Barrows, Central High School, Syracuse, New York

Dr. I. E. Drabkin, Townsend Harris Hall, The College of the City of New York, New York, New York

Miss Martha Elting, Battin High School, Elizabeth, New Jersey

Professor Horace W. Wright, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Professor Robert E. Dengler, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania

Dr. Cora A. Pickett, High School, Wilmington, Delaware

Professor James P. Templeman, Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Maryland

Miss Clara Harlan, Western High School, Washington, D. C.

These Officers, with the President for the year 1931-1932, Mr. William S. Eldridge, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, constitute the Executive Committee for 1932-1933.

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXVI, No. 20

MONDAY, MARCH 27, 1933

WHOLE NO. 710

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE GREEK PEOPLE AND THE INDO-GERMANIC MIGRATIONS DURING THE SECOND MILLENNIUM B.C.^{1a}

In order to comprehend genetically the development of the history and the civilization of a given people, it is not sufficient to investigate the high points in its life, for experience shows that decisive and directive impulses reach back into very early times, into those epochs during which the people was being developed, took root in its later (historical) home, assimilated the remnants of an older population, and, finally, entered into relations with its ethnical and cultural surroundings. Those ancient nations that are the most important in history—the Egyptians, the Babylonian-Assyrians, the Hittites, the Greeks, and the Romans (I name only some of the most prominent)—are by no means racially pure; on the contrary, ethnically they are the result of extensive commingling of peoples. Diverse racial components play an active part in the development of every people, and contribute materially to the making both of its external characteristics and of its spiritual and mental powers. Since there are hardly any nations of pure race, at least in the age when the history of nations is better known², it is understandable that the science of history uses the results of anthropology, with its measurement of skulls, only reluctantly and with great caution to elucidate the oldest history of

a nation, especially if the results of anthropological research are based on isolated finds of bones. Thus it becomes evident that one of the fundamental tasks of students of history is to clear up, for each individual people, the history of those ethnical fusions which underlie the formation of a new nation. In the case of the Greeks, this problem was formulated as early as the time of the great thinkers of their classical age. Secondly, it is manifest that the elucidation of the geographical conditions of the life of a people and of the historical and cultural surroundings of that people is of prime importance.

From what has been said above it is clear that the historian, even if he proves receptive to the results won by anthropology, will gladly cast about for sources and methods different from those of anthropology.

The thesis of that highly esteemed scholar, the late J. Beloch³, 'Only after the Greek language separated itself from the Indo-Germanic parent speech did the Greeks exist', ought to be altered into a statement to the effect that the Greek people—if we may use this term at all in the meaning that the term bears in Herodotus⁴ and ought not rather to say the Greek tribes—the people, I mean, that created classical Greek civilization arose only after its Indo-Germanic components had settled in the southern part of the Balkan peninsula and had thoroughly coalesced with the former population and had taken root in the country.

What sources have we to-day that will make it possible for us to comprehend historically events of the early Greek age, such events as the settling of Greece (the Greek mainland) by the Indo-Germans, the spreading across the Aegean Sea into Asia Minor of the Indo-Germanic peoples that settled in Greece and presently there became 'Greeks', or to understand the nationality of the 'pre-Greek' population of Hellas, which also in time became 'Greek'?

In the first place, the tales of the Greeks themselves regarding the pre-Greek population and the great migrations, commonly called the Dorian and the Ionian, and regarding the hegemony of Crete under Minos, whom Thucydides still considered a 'Greek', were for a long time our only, though very confused, sources. These accounts of the earliest times, which are in part legendary, in part merely historical 'combinations' made by the Greeks, naturally were the first to be investigated; they naturally formed the basic material of scholarly research so long as no other important sources existed. Since we are here dealing with an age from which no written records were at the disposal of the Greeks, the fundamental question is, How far back were the Greeks in fact able to remember, and how far

¹For 'Indo-germanic' American scholars would substitute 'Indo-European'. Professor Carl Darling Buck, in his recent book, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (The University of Chicago Press, 1933), writes thus (page 1, note 1):

"The term Indo-European . . . which appears to have been first used in 1813, and indicates the range from the languages of India in the east to the European in the west, is the one established in English and accords with what is most nearly the international usage. German scholars, after using 'indoeuropäisch' for a time, have long since settled on 'indogermanisch', whence 'Indo-Germanic' in some English books, especially translations of German works. The term Aryan is also used, mainly by historians and ethnologists, in the same sense, but to philologists this generally connotes more specifically the Indo-Iranian branch of the family." C. K. >

²This translation of Professor Bilabel's paper was made by Professor Ernst Riess, of Hunter College. The paper is a version, somewhat modified, of a public lecture delivered by Professor Bilabel, in Heidelberg, and subsequently published by him, under the title *Die Frühgeschichte des Griechenvolkes und die Indogermanenwanderungen des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, in *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 1932.

I am very glad to have the privilege of publishing this article, even though its preparation for publication cost me much labor, particularly because its matter lies so largely outside the range of my own studies and my own competence. Vergil's words, *Non omnia possumus omnes* (Eclogues 8.63), often come to the mind of an editor of a periodical like THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

Professor Riess most patiently answered question after question which I raised about the paper. Professor Bilabel himself had opportunity to examine the English version of his paper; he made various modifications of it.

I thought it best also to consult Professor E. H. Sturtevant, of Yale University, who has been for years a careful student of Hittite matters. At my request, he examined Professor Bilabel's paper, and made various comments on it. One of these, printed over his signature (see note 16a, below), is a substitute for a note which I had myself composed for insertion at that point. At other places, in notes which appear over my own signature, I have availed myself of Professor Sturtevant's suggestions.

I need hardly remind readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY that one must read discussions of 'prehistory' with the thought ever in mind that the statements made are tentative, subject to correction at any moment by new discoveries, or by new interpretations of older discoveries. C. K. >

^{1a}'Prehistory' has a better right to consider pure races.

³Griechische Geschichte, I.167 (Berlin, Walter De Gruyter and Co.).

⁴8.144.

back can we follow a thread of history in this web of legends and 'combinations'? What survived from that age is not small, but it has to do in the main with general and basic facts, such as these: a population akin to tribes in Asia Minor once inhabited Greece; the Indo-Germanic immigration came from the north (this is the so-called Dorian Migration); the starting-point of the Ionian Migration must be sought in East-central Greece; Crete, though it was in reality non-Greek, held an exceptional position in that period. These and other statements of the Greeks themselves have been found to be true. But the *details* of history, and also, for the most part, the genealogies of the ruling families in individual cities belong to legend and to poetry, although in these details and in these genealogies there are plain reminiscences of the former power of important centers, such as Argos, Mycenae, Tiryns, Orchomenos, and Knossos. If to-day we can go considerably beyond the results of a critical study of this source-material, whose upper limit in time would probably be about 1,300 B. C., we must give credit to the progress of linguistics, to the results of sixty years of excavations on early sites in the Aegean lands, and to the progress of investigation in the Orient, particularly Asia Minor, whose fate and civilization frequently overlap the fate of Greece and the Greek civilization, or are interwoven with that fate and that civilization.

To give a picture of these new investigations is the special purpose of this paper. Renewed and intensive study of the pertinent problems, study undertaken by me since the publication of the first volume of my 'History of Western Asia and Egypt', has shown me that the overflowing of what was later the Greek mainland by (probably) two plainly recognizable powerful Indo-Germanic waves coming from the Danube region, first about 2,000 B. C., then about 1,300 B. C., can be understood only if these migrations are set within the framework of a survey of universal history. I do not wish, however, to exclude the possibility of smaller, and therefore less easily recognizable, immigrations during this space of seven hundred years. Even before 2,000 B. C. isolated invasions into the southern Balkan peninsula may have occurred. That there were in fact such invasions Kretschmer has inferred from certain linguistic phenomena. He calls these peoples 'Proto-Indo-Germans'. The principal results of my research, which I am giving here for the first time, are two: first, we find a mighty migration of peoples about 2,000 B. C. which was by no means confined to Greece, but covered wide stretches of the Western Orient, and, secondly, we find another migration, far less extensive, which took place about the thirteenth century B. C. These results have, to be sure, been hinted at before, but such views have always been questioned in details by classical historians. The necessity of fitting the oldest Greek history into the framework of universal history, and of recognizing extensive migrations about 2,000 B. C. from Greece, at least as far as the mountain

districts bounding Mesopotamia in the east, migrations that appear to be connected by inner causes, make it imperative that I shall sketch briefly the general historical conditions of the Near East and of Eastern Europe at that date (2,000 B. C.).

At that time approximately four great powers²³, with highly developed organizations, and three independent civilizations²⁴ confronted one another (I omit the fifth, and most remote, state, the Elamitic State, about which as yet little is known; it therefore rightly falls outside my discussion). Certainly in the three civilizations I have in mind there is a strong upward movement in the fluctuations of their historical development between 2,000 and 1,700 B. C., even though we are unable to see if (and how) they influenced one another. Two or three other great powers arose in that time entirely *de novo* as the result of that mighty shifting of the peoples which I wish first to depict.

To the older group of great powers, four in number, belongs Egypt, in the extreme southeast. Between 2,000 and 1,788 B. C., in the days of the Middle Empire, as a feudal state with a culture considered classical by the later Egyptians this country rose to a cultural height which it never again reached. This development was due to a Semitic-Hamitic population whose elements had become unified at least 1,500 years earlier.

In the wide oasis of Mesopotamia we find two great Semitic states that dominate the historical picture. In the north we have the Assyrian state, founded, as we have recently learned, in the third millennium B. C., and reaching, at this time, to the west, in Asia Minor, at least as far as the Halys River. By about 2,000 B. C. this state was already declining because of the great migration of which I shall speak presently. In the southern part, Babylonia, the Semitic State of the dynasty of Hammurapi, had, since 2,067 B. C., consolidated the Semitic and the Sumerian city-states into the unified empire of Sumer and Akkad. The principal element, however, was formed by Semites (the Amorites) who had immigrated a considerable time before from Northern Syria and Southern Assyria. The two rivals, the Assyrians and the Southern Semites, show very distinct and homogeneous cultural developments. But, with respect to the country west of Assyrian Asia Minor, toward the Aegean, there is a lacuna in our historical knowledge. For the period before 2,000 B. C., we can only say that among the most important nations settled there were the Chatti, a people that in race, and even more surely in language, had little in common with the later Chatti (the Hittites)²⁵. Yet that the earlier Chatti must have formed

²³In the interests of clearness I note here that the four great powers to be considered are Egypt, two great Semitic States, and the 'Cretan' power. The three civilizations are Egyptian, Semitic, 'Cretan'. C. K.

²⁴The basis for this new, absolutely certain date will be given in the second volume of my History (see note 5, above). It rests chiefly on the fact that the assumption of the interval between the Hammurapi Dynasty and that of the Cassites, an assumption based on the Venus Tables of Ammisaduga, has no validity whatever.

²⁵Two groups of Hatti (Chatti) are to be distinguished, the older people, called by that name only, and the younger people, which adopted the same name, but was racially different from the older people. The members of this younger people were more commonly called Hittites.

²⁶See Friedrich Bilabel, *Geschichte Vorderasiens und Aegyptens*, I (vom 16ten bis 11ten Jahrhundert v. Ch. [Heidelberg, Winter, 1927]).

a far-flung state we may infer from the fact that the conquerors who created the later Chatti (Hittite) empire usurped the old name for their own community.

At the Aegean, finally, we find, about 2,000 B. C., the fourth great power, which in default of an exact knowledge of its components we call 'Cretan', after the younger Greek name⁷ of the island which formed the starting-point of its development, or call 'Minoan', after the legendary ruler Minos. As little as we know details about the political configuration of Western Asia Minor before 2,000 B. C., if we except Troy, as little can we tell anything for this period about the country that, later, was known as Greece. But it is an indubitable result of the comparative study of place-names that we may assert confidently that there was in Greece once on a time a non-Indo-Germanic, aboriginal, population, closely related in language to the inhabitants of Western Asia Minor. We shall have to speak of this later, in detail.

These preliminary remarks, which are apparently, but only apparently, alien to our topic, are necessary to the understanding of what follows. The first⁷ entrance of Indo-Germanic tribes into what was to become the Greek peninsula was not an isolated event, but was, evidently, very closely connected with a powerful movement of peoples which spread, it can be clearly discerned, at least from the middle stretch of the Danube in the west (a district which corresponds to the Hungary of to-day) around the Black Sea as far as the Caspian Sea. On that whole extended line of at least 2,200 kilometers there must have been felt an enormous pressure of Indo-Germanic masses, even if the movement did not affect all parts of the line at one and the same time. For this pressure 2,000 B. C. is only an approximate date. This pressure was strong enough to upset completely, within the span of a few decades, all the states in Western Asia, indeed all the states of which I have spoken, except the Cretan insular empire. A few centuries later it finally shook even the realm of the Pharaohs to its depths.

If large masses of people once start to move, they often do not stop for centuries. This fact is evidenced by the history of the Germanic migrations. The movement of which I spoke in the preceding paragraph, perhaps the mightiest movement known to ancient history, was due, undoubtedly, to the Indo-Germans. The oldest immigration of one of their large tribes into the southern part of the Balkan peninsula is, as I see matters, unquestionably nothing but a small episodic part of the gigantic movement of peoples along the enormously extended line mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

I shall briefly sketch the proof of these statements, a proof which to-day can be given exactly. I shall then describe in more detail only a part of the resultant struggle, that is, I shall deal with the struggle stretching from Greece to Western Asia Minor.

The southward advance of Indo-Germanic tribes that received its impetus from some event as yet un-

known to us found in what became Greece an obstacle in the older population already settled there. The population was, evidently, already dense. We shall presently take cognizance of the burning of the villages of this older population, and of the temporary destruction of this civilization. From the area about the Lower Danube, with its restricted space, an advance outside of Hellas was possible toward the islands and particularly across the Hellespont and the Bosphorus into Asia Minor. Along this line an Indo-Germanic people, a different division of the great Indo-Germanic migration, forced its way into Western Asia Minor, and mingled there with a native Asiatic group. From this amalgamation the so-called Hittites rose. These Hittites, however, differ totally from the older Chatti, antedating 2,000 B. C., whom I mentioned above^{7a}. The result of this commingling was the half-Indo-Germanic language of the new, political, Hittite empire, centered in Boghazkeui^{7b}, which merely borrowed its name from the older state. On the basis of the pictures in its rock sculptures, we may say that the population contained a strong Caucasian element. This people brought with it into the East the place-names ending in *-ssos* and *-nta*, whose high age is now proven by the texts (compare e. g. the occurrence of the name *Chattu-shash*, the older name of Boghazkeui^{7c}). The Indo-Germanic element of this population must have come from Western Asia Minor; at an earlier time it had come across the Bosphorus and the Hellespont. The destruction of the citadel of the Second City of Troy is the fiery beacon of this Indo-Germanic immigration into Asia Minor⁸.

The Black Sea formed an insuperable obstacle to the Indo-Germanic inhabitants of the steppes, who had occupied the north coast and the northeast coast of that sea. For this reason, the pressure of the Indo-Germanic movement was exerted with redoubled strength from the eastern margin of the Black Sea toward the Caspian Sea; the movement was, besides, impeded by the gigantic barrier of the Caucasus mountains. Through the passes of these mountains, and, probably, farther east around the Caspian Sea, this pressure was exerted upon the Caucasian tribes that were settled in the mountains and in the Zagros. Its first consequence here was an enormous shifting of Caucasians toward the south! Shortly before 2,000 B. C. these Caucasians, the Churri, moved toward the Upper Euphrates, destroyed completely the old Assyrian great power of the third millennium B. C., swept over the plains of Northern Mesopotamia, and pressed on toward Northern Syria (the empire of the Churri-Mitanni). These facts, possibly, caused the Amorites to migrate toward Babel. The Caucasians even advanced as far as Palestine. They were mixed with Aryan elements, and in fact were in part led by them (note the deities of the Churri-Mitanni — Mitrash, Varunash, Nasatya, Indra, Shuriash, the Aryan warrior caste of the maryannu, and several

^{7a} See note 6a, above.

^{7b} See note 16, below.

^{7c} See my History (named in note 5, above), I, 281.

⁸ The word 'first' here is correct, if we disregard Kretschmer's theory, somewhat dubious, about the 'Proto-Indo-Germans' (see the fifth preceding paragraph of the text).

⁸ We may reach the date, approximately, by the following calculation. Murshil I, King of the Hittites, destroyed Babel in 1866 B. C. Five great kings preceded him. Before the Great Empire we find divisional kings. These facts point to about 2,000 B. C. as the time of the immigration from Greece into Asia.

Aryan names of kings⁹). From the east the Aryan Manda (= the Medes) pressed upon the Caucasians of the Zagros; thus in the eighteenth century B. C. the Caucasian Cassites, driven from their mountains, conquered the Babylonian plain. In this people, too, there were Indo-Germanic elements. About 1,788 B. C. another drive—probably by the Churri—reached Egypt. In this way, at any rate, I interpret the movements of the non-Semitic and non-Indo-Germanic Hyksos, who at that time put an end to the Middle Empire of Egypt. Aryan, or Indo-Germanic, hosts also crossed the Upper Euphrates (the boundary between the Churri and the Chatti), and penetrated into the territory of the Chatti; in this territory they are always designated as Manda (= Medes). The marked differentiations shown in the languages of these different Indo-Germans prove clearly that, back in the territory where all these movements originated, the individual tribes (the Indo-Germanic peoples of history) had long parted company with one another. To find the prehistoric seats of these individual tribes, so far as they had a settled abode, cannot forever remain an insoluble task of 'prehistory'.

I believe I can satisfactorily prove what, so far as I know, is here stated for the first time. The Churri drove from the Caucasus through Armenia toward Mesopotamia and Syria; this drive, their final invasion of Egypt, and a Cassitic invasion of Babylonia from the Northeastern Zagros are connected with the Indo-Germanic shifts from the line of the lower Danube, Black Sea, Caucasus, and Caspian Sea. In the first place, the simultaneity of the events supports this thesis. If the city-states of the Hittites of the Boghazkeui archives, which resulted from the commingling of Asiatics and Indo-Germans, flourished already about 2,000 B. C., the Indo-Germanic component must have immigrated approximately one or two centuries earlier. In these Indo-Germans we have to recognize the first wave of the far-spread group of peoples that entered the old oriental empires; the immigration into the country later known as Greece, of which more will be said presently, must have followed after a brief interval. Now at the same time the first Assyrian great power, which extended to the Halys River, was destroyed by the Caucasian Churri, who went on southward across Armenia, entered Mesopotamian Assyria, and penetrated as far as Central Syria. This people also contained Indo-Germanic (more properly Aryan) elements; these elements can have come only from the East. It is significant that in the better known second millennium members of the royal family in particular bear Indo-Germanic (Aryan¹⁰) names and that they base their rule on an Indo-Germanic warrior caste. This stratum of Indo-Germanic lords among the Caucasians, which is also found among the historical Hittites, was no doubt the impelling force of this activity in forming states and in waging wars. Their arrival from the north or the northeast caused the expansion of the Churri, under the pressure of Indo-Germanic hordes which, seeking new lands, broke into the regions of the old civilization.

⁹Compare my *History* (see note 5, above), I, 136, 137, 138, 248, 252, 309, 38, 80.

¹⁰See note 1, above. C. K. >.

The Indo-Germanic expansion around the southern coast of the Caspian Sea and the entrance of Indo-Germans into the mountain valleys of the Zagros again exerted pressure on Caucasian tribes, and forced them to emigrate. In 1764 B. C. these Caucasian Cassites conquered Southern Mesopotamia, where they ruled for many centuries; Babylonia remained Cassite until 1189. That is the third great invasion of the region of ancient oriental civilization, either by Indo-Germans directly, or through movements caused by them. In the framework of the universal history of Eastern Europe and Western Asia it is really the fourth inroad. From this time the fate of this region remains under the influence of these Indo-Germanic raids and these events recur in almost the same manner at intervals of 800 or 1000 years. In Greece we have the Dorian Migration, in Asia Minor a Greek invasion affecting only the west and south coasts, alongside of an inroad by the Phrygian, Thracian, and Armenian Indo-Germanic tribes, which came from the northwest toward the end of the thirteenth century B. C. In the seventh century the Iranian Scythians and Cimmerians came from the direction of the Caucasus; at the same time the Medes, and later on the Persians, arrived also from the Caucasus region, with a close parallelism in aims and in results.

These first great advances of the Indo-Germans are, it seems to me, a new proof that the oldest home of the race must be sought in Eastern Europe¹¹.

(To be Concluded)

UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG,
GERMANY

FRIEDRICH BILABEL

THE RITUAL VALIDITY OF THE LUDI SCAENICI¹

Roman stage performances belonged to the great religious festivals of the State. In them a certain ritual accuracy was required: else they became invalid, and had to be repeated. Many instances of such repetition (*instauratio*) are recorded in Livy, Cicero, and others². Certain passages, however, which show the ritual importance of music and dance seem not to have been commented on in this connection.

When in 56 B. C. the soothsayers declared that the games had been carelessly performed, and desecrated, Cicero explains the declaration as referring to the Megalesia, presented shortly before by the aedile Publius Clodius. Clodius had gathered gangs of slaves about the theater, intending to have them kill the nobles, but the plan had been frustrated by the vigi-

¹The latest discussion of these matters is by Ernst Wahle, in the *Sachwörterbuch der Deutschkunde*, 1.418 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1929). His thesis of the dispersion of the original tribe during the earliest age of metals, around 2,000 B. C., is incorrect, for at that time the Indo-Germans were already in Greece and in Asia Minor. The Indo-Germans must have been split into different tribes as early as the third millennium. The majority immigrated toward the end of that millennium in many successive waves into their historical seats.

²This paper was read at the Thirty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Philological Association of The Pacific Coast, held at Stanford University, California, November 25-26, 1932.

³Livy 2.36, 23.30.16, 25.2.8-10, 27.6.19, 21.9, 36.9, 28.10.7, 29.11.12, 38.8, 30.26.11, 39.6, 31.4.7, 50.2, 32.7.13, 27.8, 33.25.1, 42.9, 38.35.6, 39.7.8-10; Cicero, *De Divinatione* 1.55; Valerius Maximus 1.7.4; Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.11.3-6; Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* 4.36.

lance of the consul Lentulus. Cicero³ contrasts this shocking desecration of the festival with the more usual sort of errors which vitiated the games:

'If the dancer has stopped, or the flute-player suddenly become silent, or if the boy with living father and mother has not kept his place in the sacred chariot, or has lost the reins, or if the aedile has made a mistake in the formula or in the libation-vessel, the games have not been correctly performed. These mistakes are expiated, and the minds of the immortal gods appeased by a repetition of the games'.

These mistakes seem to pertain to the more sacred parts of the festival. The sacred chariot (*tensa*) contained the ornaments of the gods, and was driven by a boy of special sanctity, both of whose parents must be living. The validity of the sacrifice depended on the use of the right words and of the proper vessels. Along with mistakes in these essential parts of the ritual is included any interruption of the dance or the music.

The ritual importance of music and dance is further indicated by a proverb which actors on the stage were said to quote, in the time of Cicero and later. The story went that, in 211 B. C., the city praetor, Calpurnius Piso, was celebrating the newly instituted Ludi Apollinares, when it was suddenly announced that Hannibal was at the Colline Gate. The men left the theater, seized their weapons, and drove off the foe. On returning, they were troubled lest the interruption should cause a *religio*, or offense to the gods, which would require a repetition of the games. But, when it was found that an old actor, Gaius Pomponius, was still dancing to the music of the flute, all anxiety was removed. There had been no interruption of the music and the dance, and so the religious validity of the performance remained intact. Hence a proverb arose, variously quoted as *Omnia secunda: saltat senex*, or *Salva res est: saltat senex*, or, if the editors of Festus have correctly restored his words, *Salva res <est dum cantat> senex*. This saying is noticed by Sinius Capito, a contemporary of Cicero, as being in current use; by Verrius Flaccus, who wrote in the first century of our era; and by Festus, who wrote in the second century of our era⁴.

Uncertainties are left, at various points, as to the origin and the meaning of the proverb. The anecdote just related is dismissed by Albert Müller as bearing the marks of an aetiological myth⁵. But the statement in which all accounts agree, that, when during some festival an enemy approached, the ritual validity of the festival was preserved by the continued performance of an aged actor, is not incredible. If the saying was *Salva res est dum cantat senex*, *cantat* may have meant either 'sings', or 'plays an instrument'. Servius quotes the form as *Salva res est, saltat senex*, which agrees better with the story of the old actor dancing. When the words were quoted by actors of later times, the

reference may have been to music and to dance performed as an interlude between the parts of a play, or to the *cantica*, those parts of the play itself which were sung to a flute accompaniment⁶. But all accounts of the saying agree on one point—that the action named (singing, playing the flute, or dancing) was essential to the ritual validity of a stage performance.

It is said by Livy⁷ that the earliest *ludi scaenici* in Rome were appearances of Etruscan actors who danced to the music of the flute, in order to appease the gods and to avert a pestilence from the city. Any interruption of such a dance or its musical accompaniment would naturally be thought a serious matter. The evidence considered in this paper would seem to show that in the later drama, however secularized, the notion of *religio* remained attached to those parts of the performance which were most primitive, the music and the dance.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM M. GREEN

REVIEW

Naevian Studies. By Thelma B. DeGraff. Geneva, New York: W. F. Humphrey (1931). Pp. x + 95.

This dissertation, which was done under the direction of Professor Knapp, is intended to be preliminary to an annotated edition of the fragments of the *Bellum Punicum* of Naevius; it therefore deals with Naevius chiefly as an epic poet. The four essays included in the book are I. Aeneas the Roman (1-15); II. The Dido-Aeneas Romance (16-40); III. The Fastigia Rerum in the Life of Naevius (41-57); IV. Some Remarks on Naevius as Poet and as Man (58-66). The work is concluded by a specimen Commentary on Naevius, *Bellum Punicum*, Fragments 1-7 (67-92), and by a selected Bibliography (92-95).

In Chapter I Dr. DeGraff had two objectives, first, to show why Aeneas was accepted as the ancestor of the Roman people, and, secondly, to emphasize Naevius's share in bringing about this result. The reason for the choice of Aeneas by the Romans lay first in his honorable reputation even from Homeric times. In the *Iliad* he is a brave warrior, a wise counsellor, and a special favorite of the gods, while his own devotion to the gods renders him already a man of distinguished *pietas*. The vagueness of Greek poets concerning Aeneas's great destiny¹ and the natural disinclination of the Romans to pick their ancestor from Greek stock complete the author's chief arguments for the acceptance of this Trojan as the father of the Roman people.

While Naevius did not originate the idea of this connection between Troy and Rome, he did establish the legend as a part of poetic tradition. On page 15 Dr. DeGraff writes:

It was sheer genius that inspired Naevius to begin his epic of the First Punic War far back in the mythical past. By so doing he made Aeneas the ancestor of the Romans more successfully than any official recognition of the connection between Rome and Ilium, or the

³Cicero, *De Haruspicum Responsis* 23.

⁴Festus, *De Verborum Significatione*, 326. Mueller (= 436-438 Lindsay); Servius, on Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.279, 8.110; Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.17.25. Festus gives two versions of the story, the first from Verrius, the second from Sinius Capito. The latter places the incident in the year 212 B. C. (not in 211 B. C.). Servius on Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.279, connects the proverb with games of the Great Mother, but in his note on *Aeneid* 8.110 his account agrees with that of Verrius. Macrobius mentions the interrupted games, but not the proverb.

⁵Philologus 63 (1904), 356.

⁶See Karl Dziatzko, *Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer*, 44-47 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1898).

⁷Livy 7.2.4.
⁸See Homer, *Iliad* 20.307-308; Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 196-198.

writings of annalists, especially those who wrote in Greek, could have done. . . .

Chapter II is the longest and the most valuable of the four essays which largely constitute this dissertation. The author's purpose here is to determine whether Naevius is to be credited with the invention of the Dido-Aeneas romance, or, as Dr. DeGraff puts it (40; compare 17), with "the poetic interpretation of the Punic Wars. . ." Her conclusion is that not Naevius, but Vergil, invented the story. This is, of course, no new theory, but the chapter is useful because it assembles and evaluates a mass of evidence which is quite as important to all students of Vergil as to the much rarer student of Naevius.

The evidence which may be held to favor the invention of the romance by Naevius, or, at least, by some one earlier than Vergil, is slight; it consists of one fragment from the *Bellum Punicum* and of three passages from the Servian commentary on the *Aeneid*. The fragment in question²,

blande et docte percontat Aeneas quo pacto
Troiam urbem liquisset,

has been so often discussed that it is hardly necessary to repeat again that there is absolutely no evidence that Dido is the person who is here asking about Aeneas's wanderings. The other passages are perplexing and Dr. DeGraff's treatment of them is less clear and conclusive than are most of her discussions. The passages are as follows: (1) cuius filiae fuerint Anna et Dido, Naevius dicit³; (2) Varro ait non Didonem, sed Annam amore Aeneae impulsam se supra rogam interemisit⁴; (3) sane sciendum Varronem dicere, Aeneam ab Anna amatum⁵. In the first passage we have merely a statement that Naevius mentions the parentage of Anna and Dido; there is no reference to Aeneas. The other two passages do refer to a romance, which, it is claimed, is vouched for by no less an authority than Varro. Servius (on *Aeneid* 5. 4) quotes Varro as mentioning only Anna's love for Aeneas; it is the Daniel-Servius⁶ who (on *Aeneid* 4. 682) reports Varro as mentioning Dido also in this connection, only to discard her story. Dessau rejects⁷ both these passages not only on the ground of the unreliability of the Servian commentary in many proved cases, but also because Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who used Varro as one of his chief authorities for the wanderings of Aeneas and who must have known *Aeneid* 4, makes no mention of the Carthaginian episode. Otto Meltzer⁸ sees in these passages an attempt on the part of Varro to get rid of the chrono-

logically impossible Dido and to substitute Anna, who may, he suggests, have been a contemporary of Aeneas; but, certainly, the singular *cuius* of the first passage (Daniel-Servius on *Aeneid* 4. 9) implies that Anna and Dido were sisters.

If we do not with Dessau reject the above evidence supplied by Servius, or by the Daniel-Servius, the consequences are more important than Dr. DeGraff (40) implies, for we are then faced with the possibility of a version of the Dido-Aeneas romance earlier than that of Vergil, since Varro's death falls some three to five years ahead of that famous *recitatio*⁹ of *Aeneid* 4, which cannot be dated earlier than 23 B. C. If such a version of the romance existed, we must admit that it could not have had the wide and permanent circulation which was attained by *Aeneid* 4, for, as Dr. DeGraff has well shown (22-26), the testimony of antiquity itself is overwhelmingly to the effect that it was Vergil's poetic power that gave currency to the romantic story which everyone knew to be chronologically impossible.

It is clear that ancient critics felt strongly the anachronism involved in the meeting of Aeneas and Dido, and that they frankly regarded the story as pure fiction. We know that Vergil usually made his inventions reasonably consistent with known facts and established traditions. How, we may ask, could he have expected a meeting of Aeneas and Dido to have any plausibility, when authorities generally had, since Timaeus's day, placed the founding of Carthage in the ninth century B. C.? Perhaps Vergil had in mind a tradition sponsored by the reputable¹⁰ authority Philistus (fourth century B. C.), to the effect that Carthage had been founded a generation before the Trojan War¹¹. Such a tradition, though incorrect, was not absurd *per se*¹². Vergil seems to have realized the poetic possibilities to be secured by telescoping these two 'foundings' of Carthage and thus transferring Timaeus's ninth-century Elissa "to the morrow of the Trojan War"¹³.

Dr. DeGraff speaks (31) of Timaeus's date for the founding of Carthage (814/13 B. C.) as having been "arbitrarily invented" by him. It was the judgment of the late Eduard Meyer, expressed¹⁴ in 1931, that Timaeus got this date from a reliable Tyrian chronicle. The probability that the date is substantially correct is held by other scholars¹⁵ also.

²Donatus-Suetonius, *De Vita Vergili* 31-32, in *Vitae Vergilianae*, by Ernst Diehl (Marcus and Weber, Bonn, 1911).

³See Otto Meltzer (see note 8, above), I. 104-105, 468.

⁴For the evidence see Dr. DeGraff, 28.

⁵Historians now agree that Tyrian colonies in North Africa were established in the period from about 1000 B. C. onwards, though Carthage was not one of the earliest Tyrian colonies. Of course, mere commercial relations between Phoenician sailors and Libyan tribes existed in extremely remote times. Jean Babelon, in the course of his article on Carthage, *History, The Encyclopaedia Britannica*¹⁴, 4.945-947 (1929), says (945) that a Sidonian trading-station, named Cambe or Caccabe, near the site of later Carthage, was established in the sixteenth century B. C.

¹¹J. L. Myres, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3.642 (Cambridge: At the University Press, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1925).

¹²*Geschichte des Altertums* 2³, Abteilung 2, 109, 79, 83 (J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, Stuttgart and Berlin, 1931).

¹³This book appeared too late for Dr. DeGraff to use it. C. K. >
¹⁴See e.g. the statement in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2.581, first full paragraph (1926). This occurs in the course of a chapter entitled *The Western Mediterranean*, by T. E. Peet, Thomas Ashby, and E. T. Leeds. See also *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*¹⁴, 4.944, column 1, bottom (in a statement signed merely "X"), and J. E. Myres, in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3.689 (see note 13, above).

<Since no one knows exactly how to interpret this fragment, it always seems to me best to leave it wholly without punctuation. So far as the Latin of this fragment, taken by itself, goes, *Aeneas* might be the questioner!!! See my discussion of the fragment in *The Classical Journal* 19 (1924), 202-203. C. K. >

³Daniel-Servius on the words *Anna, soror*, *Aeneid* 4.9.

⁴Daniel-Servius on the words *Exstincti te meque, soror*, *Aeneid* 4.682.

⁵Servius on *Aeneid* 5.4.

⁷Dr. DeGraff (19) quotes all three of these passages as from Servius.

⁸*Hermes* 49 (1914), 519-526. Dessau (520-521) thinks that Varro, in contrast with most authorities, made Anna the founder of Carthage and related her tragic death on the pyre, and that Aeneas's name was later brought into the Varronian account from the Vergil *scholia*. <Miss DeGraff knew this article. She lists it in her Bibliography, page 92, as covering "Hermes 49 (1914), 508-537". A paragraph on page 39, and notes 121, 122 show that she had carefully weighed the article. C. K. >

⁹Otto Meltzer, *Geschichte der Karthager*, 1.120 (this work was published in three volumes, 1 [1879], 2 [1896], 3 [1913], by Weidmann, Berlin).

Dr. DeGraff's discussion of the divine and human aspects of Dido and of Dido's relationship with the obscure Anna takes us into a realm of great uncertainty. The material at hand is very slight and its Oriental provenance is outside my knowledge. In the treatment of Carthaginian history and religion, generally, one questions the author's constant use of Movers's work, almost a century old, when there was available the more recent and more scientific *Geschichte der Karthager*¹⁶, by Otto Meltzer.

In Chapter III Dr. DeGraff argues for the Roman, as against the Campanian, origin of Naevius. She rightly finds the strongest evidence for her thesis in the support given to him by the *tribuni plebis*, who effected his release from prison, where the *triumviri <capitalibus>*¹⁷ had put him because of the constant abuse which he directed against leading men of the state (Gellius 3. 3. 15). If the *tribuni plebis* interposed only in behalf of Roman plebeians, their interposition in behalf of Naevius would reasonably point to his membership in the plebeian *gens Naevia*, which is known to have existed in early times at Rome. However, their interposition seems not to have been thus limited, especially after the political inequalities between patricians and plebeians had been practically broken down in the fourth century B. C.¹⁸ It is impossible to say just what rights a Campanian would have had at Rome in Naevius's day; but in view of Rome's eagerness to bind subject Campania to her it is not unreasonable to think that to a gifted stranger from a Roman colony, like Cales, or from a town like Capua¹⁹, whose inhabitants had *civitas sine suffragio*, would have been granted legal protection when in distress at Rome.

It is interesting to note that the last edition (the fourth, 1927) of the *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, by Schanz-Hosius²⁰, still holds (50) to Naevius's Campanian origin, partly on the dubious¹⁹ ground that this best explains his inconsiderate treatment by the Roman police (Gellius 3. 3. 15), but chiefly on the basis of Gellius's well-known comment (1. 24. 2) concerning the *superbia Campana* displayed by Naevius in his own epitaph. To interpret this famous phrase as merely

'arrogance *par excellence*' seems to Hosius to rob Gellius's comment of its obvious force. It may be observed that in both the passages (Cicero, *De Lege Agraria* 2. 91; Livy 9. 6. 5) cited to support the proverbial character of the phrase, *superbia Campana* is actually used of *bona fide* Campanians. Further, one may plausibly argue that when Gellius (1. 24. 3-4), passing from Naevius's epitaph to that of Plautus, finds it hard to accept the Plautine origin of the second epitaph, it is because the arrogance displayed by Plautus²⁰ is not to be explained, as Gellius feels that Naevius's arrogance is explained, by his Campanian origin. Truly, *rem diiudicare non possumus!*

Dr. DeGraff's dates for the birth (*circa* 270 B. C.) and death (201 B. C., or perhaps a few years later) of Naevius are probably as near the truth as one can approach with the scanty evidence that is extant. She approves Leuze's date (231 B. C.) for the production of Naevius's first play as being a skillful reconciliation of conflicting statements by ancient writers, though one might prefer the more generally accepted date (235 B. C.) as leaving a smaller interval between the end of the First Punic War, in which Naevius fought, and the beginning of his dramatic career.

In Chapter IV Dr. DeGraff defends (64-66) in detail her claim for the effective style of certain fragments of the *Bellum Punicum*. Less happy are those pages in which she draws a parallel between Naevius and Socrates or troubles to explain at length (60-62) to readers of a dissertation why fragments cited by grammarians cannot be expected to reveal the poetic power of the author quoted^{20a}.

The specimen Commentary on *Bellum Punicum*, Fragments 1-7 (67-92), is deliberately limited (x) to matters linguistic and literary, a limitation which the author will doubtless discard in her complete edition of the epic; "the vast province of the Saturnian verse form" (x) is one into which she must enter in any discussion of variant readings²¹. Her frequent comparisons of Naevian and Plautine usage are valuable. In her natural desire to make the commentary exhaustive she has sometimes included an unnecessary amount of familiar material (e. g. s. v. *templo*, 73; *deum*, 91). The statement (69) that "... Ennius uses both *Musae* and *Camenae*, apparently interchangeably . . .", is more than questionable. Dr. Ethel M. Steuart, in her edition of *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*²², points out (90, 94, 234) that the verse in question is not a hexameter, but a Saturnian, verse, and that *Camenae* was supplied by Vahlen. Indeed, always in using Vahlen's edition of the *Annals* Dr. DeGraff should take into account the fact that many passages which he incorporated in his

¹⁶See note 8, above. <Miss DeGraff knew this work, and used it, though she did not list it in her Bibliography. Movers's work, which, by the way, Meltzer himself used (he quotes it frequently), dealt more fully than Meltzer does with those aspects of the Dido-Elissa story in which Miss DeGraff was primarily interested. Both works were published long ago, Movers's in 1841-1849, Meltzer's first volume in 1879. In 1. VI, and 1.418 Meltzer very highly praises Movers's work. Every reader of Miss DeGraff's dissertation needs to keep in mind the very important fact that Miss DeGraff was not writing a history, either of Carthage or of early Rome. She was rather concerned with setting forth what the Romans believed, or thought they believed, or professed to believe on the various themes that form the subjects of her first three chapters. For her purposes it was absolutely unimportant whether the belief, real or pretended, had any basis in fact. We see now why Miss DeGraff used Movers rather than Meltzer. In volume 1 Movers presents "Untersuchungen über die Religion und Götterheiter der Phönizier". Meltzer's work is a "Geschichte". C. K.>

¹⁷Gellius (3.3.15) says cum . . . in vincula Romae a *triumviris* coniectus esset. But *capitalibus* must be supplied with *triumviris*.
¹⁸See F. F. Abbott, *A History and Description of Roman Political Institutions*, Sections 226, 46, near the end (Ginn, 1907). <The letter-press of the third edition (1910) is identical with that of the second edition. C. K.> Note also the appeal made to the tribunes by the patrician decemvir, Appius Claudius, as early as the year 449 B. C. (Livy 3.56.5, 11-13, 57.6).

¹⁹Mommsen, *History of Rome* 1.461-462, 540 (in W. P. Dickson's translation, in reprint of 1887; New York, Charles Scribner's Sons).

²⁰For a review of this book, by Dr. Jacob Hammer, see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 26.92-93. C. K.>

^{20a}See Dr. DeGraff, 51-53.

²⁰That its arrogant tone is, to Gellius, the objectionable feature of the Plautine epitaph is confirmed by the fact that in the third epitaph of the series, that of Pacuvius, the author's modesty and good taste are especially noted.

^{20a}I wish to register sharp disagreement with the view expressed here by Professor Saunders. No less a scholar than Mommsen would have profited if he had read, marked, learned, and digested such comments as those made by Miss DeGraff. See my remarks on this and kindred subjects in *American Journal of Philology* 35 (1914), 17, note 3 (the note runs over to page 18). See also remarks by Professor J. Wight Duff in *American Journal of Philology* 30 (1918), 108, and my comments on those remarks (*ibidem*, 109). C. K.>

²¹Dr. DeGraff did not enter into this subject at all.

²²Cambridge: At the University Press (1925).

text were admitted only on conjecture, as he explains in his Notes. Furthermore, without discounting the splendid work of Vahlen one should to-day consider also more recent studies of Ennius's epic, like those of Valmaggia²¹ and of Dr. Steuart.

A considerable body of new conclusions regarding the subjects treated in this dissertation was not to be expected in view of the frequently scant and conflicting evidence that is extant; but Dr. DeGraff has presented clearly and convincingly, in the main, a body of controversial matter which students of the Roman epic will be grateful to find made so easily accessible.

The wellnigh impeccable form of the dissertation is what we have learned to associate with all work which comes from the press under the scholarly and experienced direction of Professor Knapp.

VASSAR COLLEGE

CATHARINE SAUNDERS

MORE ILLUSTRATIONS OF ROMAN LIFE

IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 26.23-24, 89-90 I printed passages from certain recent books on life in the Ozark Mountains which illustrated some phases of ancient Roman life, e. g. fondness for pork as food, the fact that in early days the Roman house consisted of a single room, and the fact that pigs ran in the forests and fed largely on acorns.

Recently I have been reading a book entitled *Nurses on Horseback*, by Ernest Poole (New York, Macmillan, 1933). The book has to do with heroic and valuable service that is being rendered by the Nurses on Horseback to the mountain communities in certain parts of Kentucky. I quote some passages in this book which illustrate phases of ancient Roman life. The figures prefixed to the quoted paragraphs refer to pages of the book.

46-47. "For about a mile or so, we rode down the Middle Fork by a winding sandy little road. The steep hillsides on either hand were hazy and soft, that autumn day, with the warm rich gold of the beeches and the white of the sycamores clothing the slopes in lovely hues in the mellow sunshine up above. And there were great soft shadows of blue and purple down below. And deep stillness, barely a sound—until a litter of little brown pigs, in terrible excitement, came squealing and scampering over the road. I have never seen such clean little pigs as I saw all through the hills that week. For their sties are the forests and they feed on good clean beech nuts from morning to night..."

52. "...But all the rest of the time," she said, "they're quiet people—very quiet. They go to bed about seven o'clock and get up at two or three in the morning. They don't have breakfast until five, but they don't like to hurry about such things—or hurry about anything. When they're alone, they will break-

fast on cornbread and potatoes and pork. Dinner the same and supper the same. The pork just stays in the frying pan. They eat a lot of it — much too much..."

129. "...And the women had put up 'a heap' of fruits and vegetables. 'An' we got plenty of pork this year, so I reckon we'll git along," he said. The hogs fed themselves nearly all the year in the beech forests, running wild. The only time they needed corn was when snow was on the ground..."

158. "The cabin had only a single room, and that not over twelve feet square, and more than half the space was filled by a cooking stove and two double beds. Two thin young men stood by the hearth and near them sat a small girl on a keg, while a tiny boy sat on the floor toasting his bare feet in the glow from a fire of faggots and logs. The soft crackle that they made and the slow tick of the clock overhead were the only sounds in the room. The mother and nurse stood by a bed, in which sat a boy about six years old, and the nurse had her ear to his chest..."

In this connection reference may be made to Sir Walter Scott's novel, *Ivanhoe*, Chapter I. In this chapter one will find reference to a herd of swine in a forest in which "Hundreds of broad-headed, short-stemmed, wide-branched oaks, which had witnessed perhaps the stately march of the Roman soldiery, flung their gnarled arms over a thick carpet of the most delicious green sward; in some places they were intermingled with beeches, hollies, and copsewood of various descriptions, so closely as totally to intercept the level beams of the sinking sun..." and also to the fact that Gurth, the swineherd, blew his "horn obstreperously, to collect together the scattered herd of swine, which, answering his call with notes equally melodious, made, however, no haste to remove themselves from the luxurious banquet of beech-mast and acorns on which they had fattened, or to forsake the marshy banks of the rivulet, where several of them, half plunged in mud, lay stretched at their ease, altogether regardless of the voice of their keeper..."

In *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (third edition, Edited by William Smith, William Wayte, and G. D. Marindin [two volumes, London, John Murray, 1890, 1891]) there is an admirable article, entitled *Agricultura*, by William Ramsay and Augustus S. Wilkins (1.54-83). On pages 74-75 we find the following paragraph about the Roman way of handling swine:

"During a great portion of the year, wherever it was practicable, they were driven out to feed early in the morning in woods where acorns, beech-mast, wild fruits, and berries abounded; and in the middle of the day they reposed, if possible, in swampy ground, where they had not only water but mud also wherein to wallow; in the cool of the evening they fed again, were taught to assemble when the swineherd (*subulcus*) sounded his horn, and were then driven home to the farm. In winter they were not allowed to go forth when frost was hard upon the ground. When kept in the house their chief food was acorns, or, when the supply of these failed, beans, barley, and other kinds of grains and pulse..."

CHARLES KNAPP

²¹ *Frammenti degli Annali Editi et Illustrati da L. Valmaggia* (E. Loescher, Turin, 1900).

Send to-day for your free copy

THE CITY OF ROME

A fascinating wall poster—about 30 by 17 inches—reproducing in clear detail all of the important buildings as they stood in the fourth century A. D., when Rome was at the peak of her development. The photograph is that of an authentic French model—a masterpiece of miniature construction. All important buildings, temples, stadia, and locations are indicated.

An exceptional opportunity to add new interest to your Latin classroom work.

USE THIS COUPON

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas New York

(Address our nearest office)

Please mail—without charge or obligation

—a copy of the poster *The City of Rome*.

Signed _____

Position _____

School _____

City and State _____

Columbia University in the City of New York

SUMMER SESSION, JULY 10 TO AUGUST 18, 1933

Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., and various diplomas of Teachers College, and the degrees of B.D., S.T.M., Th.D., in Union Theological Seminary.

CLASSICAL CIVILIZATION

Greek Architecture, Sculpture, and the Minor Arts Professor Clarence H. Young

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Greek and Latin Classics in Translation Professor Raymond M. Weaver

GREEK

Elementary Course Professor Anita E. Klein Greek Tragedy Professor Clarence H. Young

LATIN

Cicero, De Senectute (College Course)	Professor Frank H. Cowles	Vergil, Aeneid (Advanced Course)	Professor Charles N. Smiley
The Odes of Horace (College Course)	Professor Anita E. Klein	Roman Lyric and Elegiac Poetry	Professor Clinton W. Keyes
Latin Prose Composition (College Course)	Professor Clinton W. Keyes	Latin Prose Composition (For the A.M. degree)	Professor Hubert M. Poteat
Roman Literature of the Later Empire		The Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil	
Cicero's Letters	Professor Charles N. Smiley Professor Hubert M. Poteat		Professor Frank H. Cowles

HISTORY

The Roman Empire Professor Albert T. Olmstead The Greek City State Professor Albert T. Olmstead
Eastern Europe in the Early Middle Ages Professor Nathaniel Schmidt

For the 1933 Summer Session Bulletin of Information, address
The Secretary of Columbia University, New York, New York

FIRST IN THE FIELD OF THE CLASSICS

A COMPLETE MODERN SERIES FOR HIGH SCHOOL YEARS

A modern course which retains the time-tested principles of experienced teaching.

LATIN LESSONS
SMITH-THOMPSON

A modern adaptation of the most popular first-year textbook in Latin ever published.

SECOND LATIN
SCUDDER

A unified course in Roman life and history. Selections adapted from Eutropius and Livy, and from Caesar's Gallic and Civil Wars.



THIRD LATIN
KELSEY-MEINECKE

Selections from Cicero, Pliny, Sallust, and Livy. Illustrated by photographs secured by Professor Kelsey in his travels.

FOURTH LATIN
CARLISLE-RICHARDSON

Selections from Virgil, Ovid, Catullus, Horace, and Martial, broadening the field of fourth-year Latin. Illustrations, full notes, objective tests.

All four titles conform in principle and content to the generally approved recommendations of the Classical Investigation and to College Entrance Examination Board requirements.

ALLYN and BACON

Boston

New York

Chicago

Atlanta

San Francisco

Dallas